DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 354 FL 026 343

AUTHOR	Kang, Dong-Ho
TITLE	Motivation Is Such a Complex Process in the EFL Foreign Language Classroom!
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	22p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Achievement Need; *English (Second Language); Factor Analysis; Foreign Countries; High School Students; High Schools; *Incentives; *Learning Motivation; Motivation Techniques; Questionnaires; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Self Motivation; *Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS	South Korea

ABSTRACT

This paper is an in-depth investigation of classroom language learning motivation in a Korean high school. Understanding the source of motivation and development of motivation is very important for educational and pedagogical purposes. This study surveyed 192 Korean high school students' orientations for learning English to discover what kinds of orientations could lead to motivations, and how these new cognitive variables are related to English-as-a-foreign-language motivation. The results indicated the following: (1) there were more elements than traditional integrative motivation; for example intrinsic/extrinsic and instrumental-knowledge motivations; (2) intrinsic motivation was most salient among them; (3) there existed multiple tracks of orientations vs. motivations vs. achievement; (4) all orientation factors should first be internally controllable by or for students before leading to motivations or vice versa; (5) intrinsic/extrinsic motivations were mainly related to formal classroom-related factors; and (6) self-confidence construct was associated with either intrinsic or instrumental-knowledge orientation rather than the integrative one. Numerous data-rich tables and charts appear throughout the text. An extensive literature review begins the article. (Contains 64 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 354

"Motivation is such a complex process in the EFL foreign language classroom!"

Abstract

Dong-Ho Kang

The current debate on the motivational theory might result from the lack of in-depth investigation of classroom language learning motivation. Even though social-psychologists such as Gardner and his associates provided valuable development in second language learning motivational theory, we do not know what kinds of orientations exist and further lead to motivations in the formal classroom, in particular in Korean foreign language learning contexts. Understanding the source of motivation and the development of motivation is very important for educational purposes.

Therefore, the purpose of this study of 192 students was to identify (1) the Korean high school students' orientations for learning English; (2) what kinds of orientations could lead to motivations; and (3) how the new cognitive variables are related to EFL motivation. The results indicated that (1) there were more elements than traditional integrative motivation, for example, intrinsic/extrinsic and instrumental-knowledge motivations; (2) intrinsic motivation was most-salient among them; (3) there existed multiple tracks of orientations vs. motivations vs. achievement; (4) all orientation factors should first be internally controllable by/for students before leading to motivations or vice versa; (5) intrinsic/extrinsic motivations were mainly related to formal classroom-related factors; and (6) that the self-confidence construct was associated with either intrinsic or instrumental-knowledge orientation rather than integrative one.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dong-ho Kang
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL026343

I. Introduction

A good deal of research has been done, examining motivations for language learning in the socio-psychological framework (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Gardner, 1985b; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993b). In the L2 literature, socio-psychologists such as Gardner and his associates have grounded motivational theory in a social psychological framework (Gardner, 1985a, 1985b; Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993b; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994b). Gardner & Lambert (1959) first proposed a distinction between integrative orientation and instrumental orientation. Integrative orientation refers to "social-emotional" contact with the target community, while the latter refers to pragmatic or utilitarian reasons for learning a second language. The basic assumption was based on the finding that learner attitudes toward the linguistic-cultural community of the target language influence success in second language achievement (Lambert, 1963; Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972). Lambert and Gardner found that integratively motivated learners succeeded in second language achievement because they were active learners (Gardner, 1985b, 1988). This was known as the Socio-Educational Model (Gardner, 1979, 1985b). Several themes and questions have emerged from that research.

Recent researchers have questioned whether the socio-educational model could be generalized to different contexts, in particular foreign language learning settings (Schmidt et al., 1996; Dornyei, 1990, 1994a; Clement et al., 1994; Kraemer, 1993; Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Because the socio-educational model was developed in ESL or bilingual situations (especially in Canada), where students could use the second language outside the classroom, the model focused on the social dimension of L2 motivation, that is, "integrative orientation." Recent researchers claimed that foreign language learning (EFL) orientations, in settings where most learning of English takes place in the formal classroom, might consist of sub-components of Gardner's traditional integrative/instrumental orientations as well as intrinsic/extrinsic orientation, depending on the contexts (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Dornyei, 1990; Clement et al., 1994; Julkunen, 1989; Brown, 1991; Schmidt et al., 1996). Even though Gardner claimed that "the source of the motivating impetus is relatively unimportant, provided that motivation is aroused" (1985b, p.169), the source of motivation, that is, orientation, is very important for foreign language educators in the formal classroom, in particular in Korea.

Recent debate on the socio-educational model focused on the language learning contexts, that is, whether motivation differs between second language learning and foreign language learning, in particular, between ESL and EFL (Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Dornyei, 1994a). Dornyei (1990) proposed that the socio-educational model might not directly generalize to EFL situations because foreign language learners rarely make sufficient contacts with the target language community to have clearly articulated attitudes toward that community. Therefore intrinsic versus extrinsic orientations might be a possible predictor of motivation in the foreign language learning contexts in foreign language learning contexts (Brown, 1991; Julkunen, 1989; Schmidt et al., 1996). Deci and Ryan (1985) defined "intrinsic motivation" as "an activity when a person does the activity in the absence of a reward contingency or control," while "extrinsic motivation" refers to "behavior where the reason for doing it is something other than an interest in the activity itself" (pp. 34-35).

Current research in L2 language learning motivation also recognized the importance of the intrinsic orientation factor (Dornyei, 1990a; Julkunen, 1989; Schmidt et al., 1996).

On the other hand, Dornyei (1994a) argued that Gardner's socio-educational model was based on motivational components grounded in the broader social milieu rather than in the foreign language classroom, and hence it did not include details on cognitive aspects of motivation to learn. Socio-psychologists were particularly sensitive to the social aspects of L2 motivation, while motivational psychologists have considered the motivated behaviors of human beings as individual aspects rather than as social aspects like Gardner did (Dornyei, 1994a). In foreign language contexts, where most language learning takes place in the formal classroom, rather than in the social milieu, internal/individual or cognitive/affective aspects of motivation might be more important (Schmidt et al., 1996; Dornyei, 1996).

Current researchers claimed that motivation theory from (general) psychology rather than Gardner's socio-psychological model could explain the complexity of second/foreign language learning motivation (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Dornyei, 1994a). Several recent researchers found new cognitive and affective variables in the foreign language learning motivation (Dornyei, 1990a; Clement et al., 1994; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Schmidt et al., 1996). Language learning motivation can be influenced by need for achievement (Dornyei, 1990a), students' self-efficacy or self-confidence (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Clement et al., 1994), attributions of "locus of control" or "stability": ability, luck, effort, and task difficulty in Weiner (1985, 1986), and goal setting (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

First, one possible predictor of motivation was concerned with attributions of success and failure in the foreign language learning contexts (Weiner, 1979, 1985, 1986; Weiner et al., 1971; Schunk, 1991; Keller, 1983). Attribution theory views as fundamental the way people attribute causes to events, and suggest that people vary in the way they do this (Skehan, 1989). Weiner (1985) proposed that causal attributions of success/failure can be explained in terms of three dimensions: locus of control, stability, and controllability. The locus of control was concerned with whether the result of action is within the person or within the environment (p. 551). That is, people's motivated behaviors depend on whether a person believes that outcomes occur independently of how he or she acts (external) or outcomes are likely to result from personal efforts (internal) (Schunk, 1991, p. 209). A second dimension of causality, stability, refers to whether causal attributions are stable or unstable. The third dimension of causality, controllability, was concerned with whether the causal attributions are controllable or not (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). The most dominant causes are ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck (Weiner, 1985, p. 549).

In the L2 literature, Dornyei's (1990) factor labeled "bad learning experiences" included items related to attributions of past failures. Dornyei (1990) claimed that attributions about past failure could be expected to affect motivation, because in foreign language learning contexts "learning failure" was a very common phenomenon. Dornyei's study also identified a "need for achievement" factor (related to "determination") (Atkinson & Raynor, 1974) and Julkunen's study found a factor of "helplessness" (the opposite of expectations for success). Therefore, both "bad learning experiences" and "helplessness" seemed to be related to "beliefs about failure" and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

maladaptive attributions. These two factors are likely to appear more frequently in the foreign language learning contexts than the second language contexts.

On the other hand, the attributions might have motivational properties based upon their influence on expectancy (Weiner, 1986, 1992; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Weiner (1985) suggested that expectancy and affect direct motivated behaviors. Clement et al. (1994) found "self-confidence" in the foreign language context. In the language learning literature, expectancy and self-efficacy was very similar to self-confidence (Clement, 1980; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985). Self-confidence was a little different from self-efficacy in Clement (1980) in that it involved both "a low anxious affect and high self-perceptions of L2 competence" (Clement et al., 1994, p. 422). Clement and Kruidenier (1985) proposed that self-confidence was the most important determinant of motivation to learn and use the L2 in a multicultural setting, in particular, in Canada (Clement, 1980). The replication to EFL setting showed that self-confidence also influenced L2 proficiency in Clement et al.'s study.

Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to identify what kinds of orientations Korean high school students have, whether orientations other than integrative/instrumental ones could lead to motivations, and further what kinds of new cognitive/affective variables are involved in students' motivations, considering all possible variables such as orientations, several cognitive/affective variables, integrative motive, and students' achievement.

II. Research Method

One hundred ninety-two Korean 10th grade high school students learning English as a foreign language (90 male and 102 female students) in Korea participated in this study. The researcher investigated their EFL motivation by using a questionnaire (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Clement et al., 1994; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Students completed the questionnaire in 1998. The data in the high school year (1998) were factor-analyzed to extract underlying factors of EFL students' orientations and motivations. Pearson product-moment correlations were used to assess the relationships among the motivational factors. Before conducting the main study, students were told research information and asked to sign a human-subject consent form at the beginning of October 1997. Students were also told that the information in this study would be kept confidential and they were encouraged to complete the questionnaires candidly. In addition because some of the questions asked their opinions of teaching methods, the researcher conducted the survey. In this way, the presence of English teachers on the students' responses was minimized.

Students were asked to indicate the item responses on a six-point Likert scale ranging from strong disagreement (-3) to strong agreement (+3) to remove the midpoint. The scales were administered in Korean. Responses on the negatively worded items were recorded before scoring. The number of items and internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Index of Internal Consistency) obtained with the Korean school population were presented in brackets along with scale descriptions (see Kang, 1999).

(1) Orientations (45 items): Orientations were adapted from scales used in previous studies of

second language learning (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Clement et al., 1994). Intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation scales were adopted from Harter (1981). This scale was used to assess students' reasons for learning English.

(2) Attitudes toward Americans was adapted from the scale used by Clement et al. (1994) and AMTB (5 items, .7953). This scale evaluated the extent to which the students feel positively toward American citizens.

(3) Attitudes toward learning English was adapted from AMTB and Tremblay and Gardner (1995) (5 items, .7253). This scale was used to assess the students' affective reaction toward learning the second language.

(4) Need for Achievement was adapted from Clement et al. (1994) (4 items, .5512). The scale assessed the extent to which the students desire to achieve in the second language.

(5) Motivational Intensity was adapted from Clement et al. (1994) (4 items, .7453). This scale was used to determine the degree of effort the student exerted when learning English.

(6) Students' attitudes toward learning situations were used to assess students' evaluation of teacher and evaluation of the course. Two scales, English teacher evaluation (12 items, .8236) and English course evaluation (7 items, .7204), were adapted from Clement et al. (1994).

(7) Self-confidence/self-efficacy: The following three scales, English Use Anxiety (4 items, .7682) and English Class Anxiety (5 items, .8853), and self-evaluation of English competence (4 items, .7029)/Desired English Proficiency (1 item), were adopted from Clement et al. (1994) to assess students' self-efficacy or self-confidence.

(8) Causal Attributions: Multidimensional-Multiattributional Causality Scales were adopted from Tremblay and Gardner (1995) to assess causal attributions of success/failure in L2 to ability, effort, context, and luck. There were eight scales, with three items each, e.g., ability-success (.5475), ability-failure (.5953), effort-success (.8619), effort-failure (.7253), context-success (.5286), context-failure (.8153), luck-success (.6204), luck-failure (.7914).

(9) Goal Salience Scale was developed by Tremblay and Gardner (1995) to assess the degree to which learners have specific goals associated with studying French. Two scales, goal specificity (8 items, .7538) and goal frequency (8 items, .8334), were adapted from Tremblay and Gardner in this study.

(10) Desire to learn English (10 items, .2590): This scale was adapted from "Desire to learn French" (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

(11) Persistence (10 items, .7902) and attention (10 items, .6653) were adopted from Tremblay and Gardner (1995). They included these two constructs into the motivational behavior.

First of all, factor analysis and correlation procedure were conducted to assess the sub-components of Korean 10th grade high school students' orientations and motivations. More ..specifically, 10th grade students' orientations were factor analyzed (exploratory factor analysis) to extract underlying orientation factors of EFL students. The researcher used 8.0 SPSS maximum likelihood method with oblim rotation, to be consistent with previous researchers (Gardner's social-psychologists and Clement et al., 1994), because there were high correlations between orientation factors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The researcher also entered all variables into a factor analysis to extract underlying motivational factors of Korean 10th grade high school students. In this factor analysis, the factor scores of orientations were used for the analysis. The indices of motivation variables were calculated by standardizing and summing the composite of each construct, following the previous research (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Clement et al., 1994). To be consistent with previous research methodologically (Gardner, 1985b; Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Clement et al., 1994), the researcher applied SPSS maximum-likelihood method with varimax rotation for this factor analysis. In addition the researcher conducted the correlation procedures between orientation factors and motivational factors to assess the relationships among the motivational factors during the high school years.

III. Result

1. High school students' Orientations

The researcher factor-analyzed high school students' orientation items by using SPSS maximum likelihood method with oblim rotation, following Clement et al.'s methodology. The initial factor solution was based on the criteria, eigenvalue-longer than 1.00. Because some of the items were more than loadings of 1.00, the factor solution reduced to a 5-factor solution to remove the items with a cut of .30 of inclusion of a variable in interpretation of a factor (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The five-factor solution explained 46.67% of the variance:

<Table 1- Factor matrix of High school Orientations>

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative
Integrative (F1)	8.887	22.218	22.218
Identification (F2)	3.053	7.632	29.851
Intrinsic (F3)	2.743	6.858	36.709
Extrinsic (F4)	2.272	5.679	42.388
Instrumental-knowledge(F5)	1.715	4.287	46.674

<Table 2- Factor Loadings of Orientations>

	Loadings
Factor 1: Integrative orientation	
-to learn more about what's happening in the world	.674
-to know the life of the Eng-speaking nations	.656
-to understand English pop-music	.620
-to understand the Eng-speaking nations' beh & prob	.614
-it will help when traveling	.603
-to understand Eng-speaking films, videos, TV.	.559
-to learn more about English world	.543
-to spend some time abroad	.459
Factor 2: Identification	
-in order to be similar to Americans	.767
-to think and behave like the English/Americans do	.722
-for job and studies.	-.487
Factor 3: Intrinsic orientation	
-I know when I have made mistakes without checking with the teacher.	.739
-I know whether or not I am doing well without checking the teacher.	.605
-I like difficult problems because I enjoy trying	.569
-I do extra projects so I can get good grades	-.506
-I like hard English work because it's a challenge.	.484
-I work really hard to get good grades in English.	-.416
-I like to go on to new English work that's at a more difficult level.	.392
-I ask questions in English class because I want to learn new things.	.379
-I read things because I am interested in English.	.307

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Factor 4: Extrinsic orientation

-I am not really sure if I have done well on English test until I get my papers back.	.570
-I would rather just learn what I have to in school.	.554
-I don't like difficult English work because I have to work too hard.	.495
-I do my English work because the teacher tells me to.	.476
-not sure if my work in English is really good or not until the teacher tells me to.	.468
-I know I didn't do my best on an English assignment when I turn it in.	-.402
-I like school subjects where it's easy to learn	.336

Factor 5: Instrumental-knowledge orientation

-be a more knowledgeable person	.695
-an educated person supposed to be able to speak	.660
-to take the country language exam in English	.547
-without it one cannot be successful in any field	.498
-don't want to get bad marks at school	.482
-to travel to countries where English is used	.458
-broaden my outlook	.411
-learn as many foreign languages as possible	.407
-be expected of me	.380
-read English books, newspapers, or magazines	.352
-be able to travel a lot	.337

Factor 1 received significant loadings from socio-cultural, integrative, and travel orientation items, which were considered as the sub-components of Gardner's traditional integrative orientation. Factor 1 indicates that the sub-components of the integrative orientation factor were integrated into one single integrative orientation factor like Gardner's. Therefore, this factor was labeled as "integrative orientation." On the other hand, Factor 2 showed the similarity with American people with a moderate influence of the instrumental orientation item. However, the first two items were strongly loaded to this factor, which was similar to the "identification" factor in Clement et al. (1994). Therefore, this factor was labeled as "identification."

Factor 3 received significant loadings from intrinsic orientation items (Harter, 1981). The first two items were related to internal criteria for success/failure. The rest of the items were associated with preference for challenging work and curiosity/interests. Both were at the continuum of intrinsic orientation, rather than extrinsic one. Harter (1981) distinguished motivational aspects (i.e., challenge and curiosity) from cognitive-informational ones (i.e., internal/external criteria for success/failure) at the continuum of intrinsic/extrinsic orientations. This factor represented both motivational and cognitive aspects of intrinsic orientation (Harter, 1981). Therefore, Korean high school students who were intrinsically oriented to study English, showed internal criteria for success/failure. This factor was labeled as "intrinsic orientation" factor.

On the other hand, Factor 4 received significant loadings from extrinsic orientation items (Harter, 1981). Most of them were related to extrinsic orientations such as preference for easy work, teacher approval, and external criteria for success/failure (i.e., teacher or school grades). This factor represented the opposite end of the previous factor (F3). More specifically, this factor was related to both motivational and cognitive aspects of extrinsic orientation. The sixth item, which was negatively loaded to this factor, was the internal criteria for success/failure (intrinsic), and hence this was related to the external criteria (extrinsic). High school students who were extrinsically oriented to study English also showed external criteria for success/failure. Therefore, this factor was labeled as "extrinsic orientation."

The instrumental and knowledge orientation items were significantly loaded on Factor 5

(Clement & Kruidenier, 1983). Both instrumental and knowledge orientation items were equally loaded on this factor with relatively moderate influence from the travel orientation items. For example, first two items were related to the knowledge, the next three items, to the instrumental orientation, and the sixth item, to travel orientation. As Clement et al. (1994) found in EFL high school situations, instrumental purpose or gains appeared together with a knowledge orientation factor in this high school population. This factor was, therefore, labeled as the "instrumental-knowledge" orientation.

2. High school students' Motivation

As a second step, entering all variables (using the orientation factors extracted from the previous factor analysis) into factor analysis and using SPSS factor maximum-likelihood method with varimax rotation, the researcher factor-analyzed high school students' motivations. The indices of motivation variables were computed by standardizing and summing the composite of each motivation construct. The initial factor analysis extracted an 8 factor solution with the criteria of eigenvalue, 1.00. Because there were a few items with loadings of more than 1.00, the researcher extracted 6 factors thereby reducing the number of factors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The six-factor solution explained 54.159% of the variance.

<Table 3- Factor Analysis of High School Motivation>

Label	Eigenvalue	Variance	Cumulative
Integrative Motive(F1)	7.437	21.874	21.874
Adaptive Achievement(F2)	3.704	10.895	32.769
Evaluation of LE(F3)	2.487	7.314	40.083
Maladaptive Attributions(F4)	2.128	6.259	46.362
Anxietv (Self-confidence)(F5)	1.499	4.410	50.752
Teacher Evaluation(F6)	1.158	3.407	54.159

<Table 4- Factor Loadings of Motivations>

	Loadings
Factor 1: Integrative motivation	
-goal specificity	.771
-goal frequency	.745
-persistence	.592
-integrative orientation (F1)	.566
-attention	.562
-desire to study English	.539
-motivational intensity	.528
-extrinsic orientation (F4)	.519
-attitudes toward learning English	.516
-need for achievement	.479
-attitudes towards Americans	.319
Factor 2: Adaptive Achievement	
-English score	.731
-attributions of success to effort	.613
-attributions of failure to effort	.582
-desired proficiency	.550
-self-evaluation	.510
-intrinsic orientation (F3)	.444
-identification orientation (F2)	-.426
-attributions of success to context	.332
-attributions of success to ability	.330
Factor 3: Evaluation of Learning Environment	

-English teacher style	.761
-English class attractiveness	.680
-English teacher motivation	.503
-English class difficulty	.420
Factor 4: Maladaptive attribution	
-attributions of success to luck	.512
-instrumental-knowledge orientation (F5)	-.466
-attributions of failure to luck	.399
-attributions of failure to ability	.396
-attributions of failure to context	.362
Factor 5: Anxiety (Self-confidence)	
-English class anxiety (reversed)	.721
-English use anxiety (reversed)	.668
-(self-evaluation) (cross loadings)	.423
Factor 6: Learning Environment (teacher evaluation)	
-English teacher rapport	.753
-English teacher competence	.659
-English class usefulness	.404
-(English class attractiveness)	.345
-(English teacher motivation)	.328

Variables loaded on the first factor (F1) were similar to Tremblay and Gardner's (1995) extended version of the earlier socio-educational model proposed by Gardner & MacIntyre (1993b). The main components of the extended version were "integrative motive." Factor 1 received significant loadings from Gardner's (1985b) traditional motivation factor, such as motivational intensity (efforts), attitudes towards learning English, and desire to study English, plus integrative orientation and attitudes towards Americans. These components were called integrative motive in the latest version of the socio-educational model (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993).

In addition, Tremblay and Gardner (1995) added new variables to this latest version of the socio-educational model such as goal saliency, valency, and motivational behavior. First, two variables, goal frequency and goal specificity, loaded to Factor 1, were the indicator variables of the goal salience, while the other three variables, persistence, attention, and motivational intensity, were components of the motivated behavior factor, in Tremblay and Gardner (1995). In addition, "desire to study English" and "attitudes toward learning English" were sub-components of the valence factor. The differences between Tremblay and Gardner's (1995) and Factor 1 in this study were, however, the loadings from the "need for achievement" and extrinsic orientation factors. Need for achievement was reported in Dornyei's (1990b) research with EFL high school population in Hungary as one of important foreign language learning motivational factors. The extrinsic orientation factor also seemed to be important to Korean high school students. However, most items were related to Gardner's traditional integrative motivation and new cognitive variables, this was labeled as "integrative motive" factor.

Factor 2 received significant loadings from achievement, attributions, and intrinsic orientation factor. The loadings of three variables, English score, self-evaluation, and desired proficiency, were related to students' second language learning achievement, while the loadings of attribution variables, to adaptive attributions (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Weiner, 1985). In addition the loading of intrinsic orientation was directly associated with second language learning

achievement. The loadings of both intrinsic orientation and self-evaluation on this factor suggested that perceived cognitive competence was related to one's motivational sub-scales of intrinsic/extrinsic orientations, that is, the higher one's perceived competence, the more intrinsic one's orientation (Harter, 1981). In other words, intrinsically-orientated students, who were highly confident, tended to attribute success/failure to (internally) controllable causes and finally succeeded in second language learning (Weiner, 1985, 1986; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Schmidt et al., 1996; Harter, 1981). This might be labeled as "adaptive achievement."

Factor 3 was related to the evaluation of the learning environment factor in Gardner (1985b) and Clement et al. (1994). The factor loadings were combination of English teacher and course evaluations. This was similar to the dimension of learning environmental factor in Clement et al. (1994). Therefore, this was labeled as "evaluation of learning environment" dimension.

Factor 4 received significant loadings from attribution variables and the instrumental-knowledge orientation factor. High school students attributed their success or failure of foreign language learning to luck, ability, or environment. These causality variables were related to the locus of control and controllability (Weiner, 1985, 1986). This factor was similar to maladaptive attribution (i.e., attributions of success/failure to uncontrollable causes) proposed by Tremblay and Gardner (1995) and "beliefs about past failure" (i.e., attributions of success/failure to external causes) found by Schmidt et al. (1996). This was also related to "attribution about past failure" in Dornyei (1990a) and "helplessness" factor in Julkunen (1989). The interesting finding was the negative loading of instrumental-knowledge orientation to Factor 4. This indicates that the more students are instrumentally (knowledge) orientated, the less they are likely to attribute their success/failure to (external) maladaptive causes. In other words, the more they were likely to attribute their success/failure to adaptive causes they can (internally) control. This implies that instrumental-knowledge orientation might be directly related to both locus of control and controllability with Korean high school population. This factor was labeled as "maladaptive attribution" factor, following Tremblay and Gardner (1995).

Factor 5 was related to anxiety and self-evaluation, which are components of the self-confidence construct proposed in Clement's social context model (Clement, 1980; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985). The anxiety factor was also found in several foreign language learning contexts (Julkunen, 1989; Schmidt et al., 1996). The interesting one was the complex variable, self-evaluation construct, which had cross loadings between F2 and F5. The self-confidence construct was found in multilingual or second language learning situations where there were frequent contacts with the target community (Clement, 1980; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985). Clement et al. (1994) also found this construct in even foreign language learning contexts, which was directly related to foreign language learning achievement.

However, self-evaluation variable was a little more significantly loaded on Factor 2 than Factor 5: .510 vs. .422, but the cross-loadings were not significantly different between Factor 2 (achievement) and Factor 5 (self-confidence). Self-confidence factor was, if any, not strong in this context, compared with Clement et al.'s (1994). Even though the loading from self-evaluation was moderate, this factor indicated the emergence of the self-confidence construct during the high

school years, because Korean high school students had a few contacts with native speakers of Americans at school, but it was still relatively minor (3 hours a week). Therefore, this factor was labeled as anxiety or self-confidence.

Factor 6 received significant loadings of the evaluation of the learning environment. This factor seemed to focus on the evaluation of English teacher rather than course evaluation (see the significant loadings of the first two variables). This was similar to attitudes towards learning environment factor (Gardner, 1985b; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993b). Therefore, this was labeled as the "student evaluation of English teacher." However, the effects of teacher evaluation factor to motivation seemed to be relatively low, because this factor explained the lowest variance of motivation.

In summary, there seemed to be multiple paths of orientations to motivations in the above factor loadings. Each orientation was loaded to different motivation factors with Korean high school students. Integrative orientation was related to motivation (F1), as in the current extended version of the socio-educational model (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Factor 1, integrative motive, was really similar to the recent development of integrative motive proposed by Tremblay and Gardner (1995). That is, this motivation factor (F1) was composed of traditional attitudes-based integrative motivation plus cognitive constructs. Therefore, this motivation factor (F1) supported the recent arguments for the expansion of traditional integrative motivation to include new cognitive constructs (Dornyei, 1994a, 1994b; Schmidt et al., 1996; Oxford & Shearin, 1996). However, the factor loadings of the extrinsic orientation and need for achievement to Factor 1 showed the different aspect of foreign language learning motivation from that of second language learning motivation (Dornyei, 1990a; Harter, 1981; Julkunen, 1989; Schmidt et al., 1996). Therefore, the cognitive-based motivation constructs were associated with integrative orientation with a moderate influence from the extrinsic orientation, that is, integrative and extrinsic motivations.

Secondly, the intrinsic orientation was directly related to adaptive attributions and further achievement(F2). So highly intrinsically-motivated students were more likely to attribute success/failure to causes they can internally control and further to succeed in foreign language learning. Instrumental-knowledge orientation was negatively associated with the maladaptive attributions(F4) with Korean high school students. The negative loading of instrumental-knowledge orientation indicates that the more students are instrumentally (knowledge) orientated, the more they attribute their success/failure to adaptive causes that they can control internally.

Finally, the emergence of the self-confidence construct, the combination of anxiety and self-evaluation, indicates a little more contact with a target community during the high school year. This factor supported the argument proposed by Clement et al. (1994). That is, the self-confidence construct might be found in situations where there were frequent contacts with a target community. However, self-evaluation had cross-loadings between adaptive achievement (F2) and self-confidence (F5). Au (1988) argued that self-evaluation was more related to second/foreign language proficiency or achievement rather than anxiety or self-confidence. Even though self-evaluation was slightly more loaded to adaptive achievement (F2) than self-confidence (F5), the difference was not significant.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Relationships between orientations and motivations

As Gardner(1985b) mentioned, students should be motivated to study a second/foreign language. Orientations were no more than reasons for studying a second/foreign language without motivations or motivated behavior. Therefore, correlations between orientation factors and motivation factors were conducted. Orientation factor scores were extracted from the previous factor analysis and each motivation factor was calculated by standardizing and aggregating the variables corresponding to that motivation factor, following Clement et al. (1994). In addition adaptive attributions were extracted from motivation factor(F2) to see if there were significant relationships.

<Table 5- Significant Correlations between Orientations and Motivations>

Factor	Integrat	Ident	Intrinsic	Extrinsic	Instru-know
Motivation(F1)	.464**		.520**	.438**	.439**
Adaptive	.339**	-.266**	.345**	.309**	
LE(F3)	.167*		.348**	.147*	.168*
Maldaptive(F4)					-.359**
Self-confiodence(F5)			.279**		.418**
TE(F6)		-.155*	.212**	.202**	.186*

Note: LE-learning environment and TE-teacher evaluation.

All orientations except identification were significantly correlated with motivation (F1). This indicates that integrative, intrinsic/extrinsic, and instrumental-knowledge orientations are associated with foreign language learning motivation(F1). The strong influence of integrative and instrumental-knowledge orientations to foreign language learning motivation suggested that the extended version of the socio-educational model could be applicable to foreign language learning environments(F1), at least in the high school population, as in Tremblay and Gardner's (1995) as well as in current research conducted in the foreign language contexts (Dornyei, 1990a; Schmidt et al., 1996), so called "integrative motive." This indicates that strong integrative and instrumental-knowledge motivations existed during the high school year. However, the highest correlation between intrinsic orientation and motivation (F1) among the relationships indicates that the intrinsic motivation was the most influential during the high school year (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

In addition all orientation factors were significantly correlated with adaptive attributions, while only instrumental-knowledge orientation was negatively with maladaptive attributions. The negative correlation between instrumental-knowledge orientation and maladaptive attributions indicates that the more students are instrumentally (knowledge) oriented, the less they are likely to attribute their success/failure to maladaptive causes which they cannot control internally; in other words, the more they attribute their success/failure to adaptive causes. This means that students' orientations were related to the locus of control (internal vs. external) and controllability. Thus, orientations such as integrative, instrumental-knowledge, intrinsic/extrinsic orientations were sometimes controllable and led to achievement, otherwise they might be uncontrollable and lead to helplessness. Therefore, students' perceptions of controllability might influence their orientations, before leading to motivation.

As far as learning environment factors were concerned, intrinsic/extrinsic orientations were significantly correlated with LE factors, while integrative and instrumental-knowledge orientation factors were either moderately or not correlated with them. This finding showed specific differences between second language learning and foreign language learning contexts. In other words, Gardner and his associates could find strong connections between integrativeness (i.e., integrative and instrumental orientations) and attitudes towards learning contexts (i.e., the learning environments) in the second language learning contexts, while intrinsic/extrinsic orientations were strongly associated with language learning environments in the foreign language learning contexts. Therefore, intrinsic/extrinsic orientations were more related to foreign language learning environment factors than integrative or instrumental-knowledge orientations were. This finding also explained why Clement et al. (1994) did not find any relationship between integrative motive factor and language learning environments in their research. The integrative and instrumental-knowledge orientations might not be related to formal classroom learning. As a matter of fact, the instructions in the foreign language learning environments, in particular in Korea, might not be designed to meet students' integrative and instrumental purposes.

On the other hand, the self-confidence construct was significantly correlated with intrinsic and instrumental-knowledge orientations. The strong correlations indicate different aspects of foreign language learning motivation from second language learning.
The self-confidence construct was usually associated with integrative orientation in the second or multilingual environments (Clement, 1980; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985), where there were frequent contacts with the target community. However, Clement et al.'s work (1994) also found that the self-confidence construct was related to both orientations (i.e., integrative and instrumental-knowledge) and the indices of achievement in foreign language environment, in Hungary. The above finding indicates that the self-confidence construct might be related to other motivational constructs such as intrinsic or instrumental-knowledge orientations rather than integrative orientation in Korean context (Clement, 1980; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985). That is, the higher one's perceived competence, the more intrinsic one's orientation (Harter, 1981). Therefore, intrinsic and extrinsic orientations rather than integrative ones were associated with students' self-confidence in Korean foreign language learning context.

IV. Summary/Conclusion

Traditionally, the socio-educational model was based on the socio-psychological aspects of second/foreign language learning motivations (Gardner, 1985b; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993b). However, L2 motivation was much more complex than simple traditional integrative/instrumental motivations in this study. Foreign language motivation of Korean school population consisted of a multi-factor construct, not a single-factor construct such as "integrative motive." Multiple motivations were involved with foreign language learning, and further there may be multiple pathways of orientations, motivations, and achievement. This study also showed that foreign language learning motivation was more involved with intrinsic/extrinsic motivations rather than integrative/instrumental motivations with the Korean school population.

First of all, this study confirmed several arguments in foreign language motivations from

previous studies. First of all, this study showed that motivation was not a single construct like Gardner's "integrative motive" factor, but a multi-factor construct which was composed of several sub-components, depending on the language learning contexts (Bardwell & Braaksma, 1984; Schmidt et al., 1996). The sub-constructs of motivation (F1) supported the recent arguments for the expansion of the socio-educational model to include the new cognitive/affective constructs in the formal classroom EFL learning (Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Schmidt et al., 1996). For example, the specific components of motivation(F1) consisted of cognitive constructs such as goal-salience, valence, need for achievement, and motivated behavior (attention, persistence, and motivational intensity). This finding also confirmed the work of Tremblay and Gardner (1995) in Canada. Therefore, internal, cognitive and affective aspects of motivation might be more important in foreign language contexts, where most of the language learning took place in the formal classroom (Schmidt et al., 1996; Dornyei, 1996).

In addition the appearance of the attribution factors in both periods, labeled as "adaptive" and "maladaptive" attributions, also supported the above arguments, that is, a multi-factor construct, not a single construct such as "integrative motive." Weiner (1985) proposed that causal attributions of success/failure could be explained in terms of three dimensions: locus of control (internal vs. external), stability, and controllability. The causal attributions of the Korean school population seemed to be related to (locus of control) and controllability. Several previous researchers found that attributions of success/failure affected motivations (Schmidt et al., 1996; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Dornyei, 1990a; Julkunen, 1989). Schmidt et al. found two causal attributions, i.e., the dimension of locus of control in Weiner (1985): determination and beliefs about failure. Determination factor included items which attribute success/failure to ability and effort, that is, internal causes, while the "beliefs about the failure" factor was concerned about external causes such as the teacher and task difficulty. The internal causes were directly associated with motivational strength in the factor loadings, while beliefs about failure explained a small amount of variance. This could be due to the fact that Schmidt et al.'s subjects did not represent the normal EFL school population, because students voluntarily enrolled to study English in private EFL institutes. On the other hand, Tremblay and Gardner (1995) distinguished adaptive from maladaptive attributions. This dimension was related to Weiner's (1985) third dimension of causes, controllability (i.e., whether one controls or not). In both studies, internal and controllable causes were directly associated with motivation.

However, Dornyei (1990) claimed that the attribution about past failure could be expected to affect motivation, because learning failure was a very common phenomenon in foreign language contexts, unlike Schmidt et al. (1996). Dornyei (1990a) and Julkunen (1989) in the research with EFL populations found that bad learning experience and helplessness explained foreign language learning motivation. Both factors were related to beliefs about failure and maladaptive attributions (Schmidt et al., 1996; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). The emergence of maladaptive attributions in the high school year supported the findings reported by Dornyei (1990a) and Julkunen (1989). Therefore, learning failure might be a very common phenomenon in the foreign language contexts, as Dornyei argued. In addition the loadings of adaptive attributions to achievement during the high school year also supported the previous findings (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Schmidt et al., 1996). In other words, students, who attributed success/failure to internally controllable causes, were more motivated to study, which in turn led to achievement or vice versa.

Furthermore, all orientations were significantly associated with either adaptive or maladaptive attributions. Therefore, this indicated that any orientation first should be internally

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

controllable by/for students, which could lead to motivation and further achievement, as in Schmidt et al. (1996) and Tremblay and Gardner (1995). Otherwise, the orientation might lead to the "helplessness" or "beliefs about the failure" (Julkunen, 1989; Dornyei, 1990a; Schmidt et al., 1996; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

Secondly, the findings in this study supported the recent arguments for multiple motivations. Previous researchers were concerned about the question of whether Gardner's conceptualization of "motivation" was restricted to the integrative motive (Dornyei, 1994b; Oxford & Shearin, 1994, 1996; Schmidt et al., 1996). For example, multiple motivations were involved with foreign language learning during the high school year: integrative, intrinsic/extrinsic, and instrumental. This indicated that intrinsic/extrinsic motivations as well as traditional integrative and instrumental ones were involved with foreign language learning.

On the other hand, the factor loadings of motivations and correlations among them indicated multiple pathways of orientations, motivations, and achievement. That is, the integrative orientation was mainly associated with motivation (F1), which in turn influenced achievement during the high school year. The extrinsic orientation was mainly associated with both LE factors and motivation (F1), which further influenced achievement or vice versa in high school years. The intrinsic orientation was mainly associated with both adaptive attributions and LE factors, which in turn led to achievement during the high school year. Finally, the instrumental orientation was mainly associated with attributions (both adaptive and maladaptive), which might sometimes lead to achievement. Otherwise, the instrumental motivation could lead to helplessness.

Thirdly, the data in this study partially confirmed the existence of the self-confidence construct suggested by Clement and his associates (Clement, 1980, 1986; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985; Clement et al., 1994). Clement claimed that the self-confidence was the most important determinant of motivation to learn and use to the L2 in a multi-cultural settings, in particular, in Canada (Clement, 1980; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985). The self-confidence construct appeared independently with Korean high school population. However, the self-evaluation had cross-loadings between either self-confidence(F5) and achievement(F2). Clement et al. (1994) also found that the self-evaluation was associated with the anxiety in the EFL contexts, so called, "self-confidence," while Au (1988) argued that the self-evaluation was related to second/foreign language proficiency or achievement, rather than the self-confidence. The independent factor loading of the self-confidence indicated the existence of the self-confidence construct in foreign language learning environments, as in Clement et al. (1994). However, this factor was relatively weak, because the self-evaluation was loaded to more "achievement"(F2) than to self-confidence(F5).

Further investigation showed that the self-confidence construct was mainly associated with intrinsic/extrinsic orientations, rather than the integrative orientation with the Korean school population. The self-confidence construct could be salient in multi-cultural settings, where students can communicate with a target community, but this construct was associated with the intrinsic/extrinsic orientations in the formal classroom contexts. In other words, the higher one's perceived competence, the more intrinsic one's orientation (Harter, 1981). This explained why the self-confidence appeared weak and the self-evaluation had cross-loadings between the self-confidence and achievement. In the foreign language learning contexts, the self-confidence was correlated with the intrinsic/extrinsic orientations/motivations, which in turn could lead to achievement. Therefore, the debate between Clement and his associates and, Au (1988) could result from the differences between second language and foreign language learning contexts.

However, Korean EFL students also differed from the previous models. In the

socio-educational model, the integrative orientation was closely associated with LE factors and the self-confidence (see Clement's (1980) social context model), while this study showed that only formal classroom-related orientations, i.e., intrinsic/extrinsic and knowledge, were mainly associated with both the self-confidence and LE factors in this study, even though all orientations were significantly correlated with attributions. It seemed that intrinsic/extrinsic orientations, rather than the integrative one, were associated with the self-confidence and LE factors, which was related to attributions and further influenced motivation (F1) in the formal classroom (Harter, 1981; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1990). These correlations showed the major distinction between the socio-educational model and this study. These findings also explained why Clement et al. (1994) did not find any relationship between the sub-components of traditional integrative/instrumental orientations and LE factors in the foreign language contexts.

V. Educational Implications

The Korean school population reported several orientations, which included intrinsic and extrinsic orientations as well as integrative and instrumental ones. Students' orientations, whether those were associated with motivation or not, could be very important for educational purposes (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). It has been reported that intrinsic motivation was potentially a main motivator of the educational process (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1990; Deci et al., 1991; Dornyei, 1994a). It has also been found that extrinsic motivation tends to undermine intrinsic motivation for interesting tasks and to impede the internalization of regulations for uninteresting tasks (Deci et al., 1991; Ryan, Mims, & Koestner, 1983; Freedman, 1965; Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

Deci and his associates argued that the shift from extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation can be achieved by satisfying three basic psychological needs: need for competence, relatedness, and autonomy (or self-determination) (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1990; Deci et al., 1991). According to self-determination theory, the satisfaction of these three basic innate needs facilitates intrinsic motivation. Researchers have suggested several useful approaches for enhancing students' intrinsic motivation in the foreign language learning literature (Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). The first basic condition, need for competence, was related to self-efficacy or self-confidence. This study showed that the intrinsic orientation was positively associated with the self-confidence. Oxford and Shearin (1994) argued that attributions of past accomplishment could play an important role in developing self-efficacy (see Dornyei, 1990). They further argued that once a strong sense of self-efficacy/self-confidence can be developed, a failure may not have much impact. Foreign language teachers, therefore, should help students develop the initial self-efficacy by matching difficulty of tasks with students' ability (Dornyei, 1994a), providing meaningful, achievable, and success-engendering language tasks (Oxford & Shearin, 1994), and in turn increasing experience with success (Keller, 1983). For example, foreign language teachers might ask students what they can do or what they cannot do in L2. L2 teachers can promote students' self-confidence or self-efficacy by emphasizing what they can do in L2 (Dornyei, 1994a). In addition L2 teachers can provide students with useful techniques, e.g., language learning strategies, when students do the specific tasks. Whenever they are successful in L2 tasks, L2 teachers can provide positive feedback for students, which could result in a strong sense of self-efficacy.

In addition, all orientations were relatively equally associated with attributions in this study. Students' attributions were related to either locus of control (i.e., internal vs. external causalities), or controllability (Weiner, 1985, 1986). This study showed that adaptive attributions (e.g., attributions of success/failure to internally controllable causes) were positively correlated with motivation or

achievements, while maladaptive attributions (e.g., attributions of success/failure to externally uncontrollable causes), negatively with them. Therefore, students' orientations first appear to be internally controllable by/for them before leading to motivation and further achievement.

Forsterling pointed out that it would be especially important to make internal attributions (ability and effort) after success, whereas unstable causes (bad luck or lack of effort) would appear to be most desirable following failure (see Forsterling, 1985). Therefore, Dweck (1975) has claimed that helpless individuals should be trained to attribute success and failure to effort (an internally controllable factor). Because Korean school students were likely to attribute their success/failure to uncontrollable causes (e.g., ability and context), language teachers should help students to attribute their failures to an internal, unstable, and a controllable attribute (e.g., lack of effort and the use of inappropriate strategies) rather than lack of ability (Oxford, 1990; Dornyei, 1994a).

The second condition, relatedness, for enhancing intrinsic motivation, involves "developing secure and satisfying connections with others in one's social milieu" (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1990; Deci et al., 1991; Maslow, 1954; see Keller, 1983). Keller (1983) argued that important personal needs were met by the learning situations to increase motivation (see McClelland, 1953; Maslow, 1954). He suggested that instructors should provide opportunities for no-risk cooperative interaction, because the need for affiliation was a prerequisite to more challenging risk-taking activities (see Maslow, 1954). In addition several researchers in L2 recommended that foreign language teachers should adopt the role of a facilitator rather than an authority figure in the classroom, thus increasing students' intrinsic motivation (Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

The basic need, autonomy, refers to "being self-initiating and self-regulating of one's actions" (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1991; Deci et al., 1991). It has been operationally defined as either "teachers' orientation toward autonomy" or "degree to which teachers involve students in decision making" in the classroom environments (Ryan & Grolnick, 1986, cited in Ames, 1992). Ames (1992) suggested that instructors should provide students with more opportunities in decision making, but that students' choice be guided by interest, not by an intent to minimize effort or avoid failure (see Keller, 1983; Ryan et al., 1985). Furthermore, Ames argued that instructors guide students for selecting, planning, and applying appropriate strategies to shift the locus of responsibility from the teacher to the students. The specific methods to satisfy autonomy/self-determination in L2 motivation were also suggested by Dornyei (1994a) as follows: (1) foreign language teachers make the syllabus of the course relevant by basing it on needs analysis and involving the students in the actual planning of the course program; (2) discuss with students the choice of teaching materials for the course (both textbooks and supplementary materials), pointing out their strong and weak points (in terms of utility, attractiveness, and interests); (3) promote learner autonomy by allowing real choices about alternative ways to goal attainment, minimizing external pressure and control (e.g., threats or physical punishments) (pp. 281-283).

On the other hand, the highest variance of integrative orientation in the factor analysis indicated that students' integrative orientation can lead to motivation by satisfying students' integrative orientation. The approach above has emphasized the role of socio-cultural components in foreign language learning literature (Hymes, 1972; Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). These researchers have claimed that socio-cultural competence plays an important role of "communicative competence" in the current communicative language teaching approach. As high school population reported a strong interest in the target culture, foreign language teachers have to teach culture at the earliest levels, as Brooks (1968) pointed out. A number of studies reported that students have shown a positive attitude toward required language

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

study, especially if the socio-cultural component was emphasized (Ely, 1986a; Morello, 1988; Bacon & Finneman, 1990; Roberts, 1992). Therefore, integration of language and culture could function as a positive attitude and further motivation to study a foreign language.

Many foreign language educators have claimed that culture study should be incorporated into the foreign language learning (Brooks, 1968, 1971; Morain, 1983; Kramsch, 1983; Seelye, 1993; Omaggio-Hadley, 1993; Arries, 1994). Several traditional activity approach has been suggested such as "culture capsule," "culture assimilator," "culture cluster," mini-drama, field trips, visits by native speakers, and utilizing authentic materials (Taylor & Sorenson, 1961; Meade & Morain, 1973; Fiedler, et al., 1971; Morain, 1979, 1983; Kalivoda, et al., 1971; Seelye, 1993). These traditional techniques showed how the cultural components could be incorporated into the language learning activities. For example, foreign language teachers can select the situation of the difference between a Korean and American culture custom in paragraphs or cartoons (visuals, slides, etc.). L2 teachers can ask students to list the differences between two cultures in pairs or in groups. Both L2 teachers and students can discuss why they behave differently in the classroom. Once students understand the cross-cultural differences, students can perform role-plays based on the situation in English (e.g., culture capsule or culture assimilator).

However, Crawford-Lange and Lange (1984) argued that an "information only" approach to culture may result in stereotypes, because such an approach provides no means of accounting for cultural variation (see cited in Omaggio-Hadley, 1993). Therefore, foreign language teachers should develop students' cross-cultural awareness systematically rather than simply adopting the socio-cultural components to satisfy students' integrative orientation (Dornyei, 1994a). More recently, the "anthropology process" approach suggested taking into account of both the process itself and the problems that may arise (Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Kramsch, 1983; Arries, 1994). The culture unit plans suggested by these researchers can be easily incorporated into the foreign language classroom by foreign language teachers (see Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Arries, 1994).

For example, foreign language teachers can develop a cultural syllabus in which everyday life situations can be included such as family, food, time, greeting and so on. This is similar to the anthropological approach. Furthermore, target language units should be developed, corresponding to these situations. Both a culture and a language unit should be developed from the basic (e.g., family or food) to more complex ones (e.g., religion and economics). In this way, foreign language teachers can develop students' cross-cultural awareness systematically by combining a culture unit with a language unit.

<References>

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(3), 261-271.

Arries, F. Jonathan. (1994). Constructing culture study units: A blueprint and practical tools. Foreign Language Annals, 27, 523-534.

Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second-language (L2) learning. Language Learning, 38, 75-100.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bacon, S. M. & Finnemann, M. D. (1990). A study of the attitudes, motives, and strategies of university foreign language students and their disposition to authentic oral and written input. Modern Language Journal, 74(iv), 459-473.

Bagnole, J. W. (1993). The magic and mystery of motivation in TEFL and language learning. TESOL Matters (Februrary/March, 10).

Bandura, A. & Shunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 586-598.

Bardwell, R. & Braaksma, E. F. (1983). Motivation as multifactor trait. Journal of Psychology, 119(1), 5-14.

Brooks, Nelson. (1968). Teaching culture in the foreign language classroom. Foreign Language Annals, 1, 204-217.

Brooks, Nelson. (1971). A guest editorial: Culture-a new frontier. Foreign Language Annals, 5, 54-61.

Brown, H. D. (1991). TESOL at Twenty-Five: What are the issues? TESOL Quarterly, 25(2), 245-260.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1, 1-47.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1, 245-276.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6, 5-35.

Clement, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact, and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, & P. M. Smith (Eds.), Language: Social Psychological Perspectives (pp. 147-154). Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press.

Clement, R. (1986). Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5(4), 271-290.

Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, A. K. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. Language Learning, 44(3), 417-448.

Clement, R. & Kruidenier, B. G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. Language Learning, 33, 273-291.

Clement, R. & Kruidenier, B. G. (1985). Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: A test of Clement's model. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 4, 21-37.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. Language Learning, 41(4), 469-512.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Csikszentmihalyi, M. & Rathunde, K. (1992). The measurement of flow in everyday life: Toward a theory of emergent motivation. In R. Dienstbier & Janis. E. Jacobs (Eds.), Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 40, Developmental perspectives on motivation (pp. 57-97). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1990). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 38, Perspectives on motivation (pp. 237-288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletrier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. Educational Psychology, 26, 325-346.

Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign-Language Learning. Language Learning, 40, 45-78.

Dornyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. Modern Language Journal, 78(iii), 273-284.

Dornyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! Modern Language Journal, 78(iv), 515-523.

Dornyei, Z. (1996). Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. In R. Oxford. (Ed.), Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century (pp. 71-80). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Dweck, C. S. (1975). The role of expectations and attributions in the alleviation of learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 674-685.

Forsterling, Friedrich. (1985). Attributional retraining: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 98(3), 495-512.

Gardner, R. C. (1980). On the validity of affective variables in second language acquisition: Conceptual, contextual, and statistical considerations. Language Learning, 30, 255-270.

Gardner, R. C. (1985a). Motivation questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript.

Gardner, R. C. (1985b). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London, Canada: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, R. N. (1959). Motivation variables in second language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13, 266-272.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1992). A student's contribution to second language learning. Part I: Cognitive variables. Language Teaching, 25, 211-220.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993a). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. Language Learning, 43(2), 157-194.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993b). A student's contributions to second-language learning. Part II: Affective variables. Language Teaching, 26, 1-11.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994a). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. Modern Language Journal, 78(iii), 359-368.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994b). On motivation: Measurement and conceptual considerations. Modern Language Journal, 78(iv), 424-527.

Harter, Susan. (1981). A new self-report scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom: Motivational and informational components. Developmental Psychology, 17(3), 300-312.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Julkunen, K. (1989). Situation- and task-specific motivation in foreign-language learning and teaching (Publication in Education No. 6). Joensuu, Finland: University of Joensuu.

Kalivoda, B. T., Morain, G., & Elkins, J. R. (1971). The auto-motor unit: A listening comprehension strategy that works. Foreign Language Annals, 4, 393-400.

Kang, D. H. (1999). Motivation and its change in foreign language context. Unpublished Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Instructional design theories and models (pp. 386-433). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

MacIntyre, D. P. & Gardner, R. C. (1994a). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. Language Learning, 44, 283-305.

Maslow, A. H. (1954, 1970). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

Meade, B. & Morain, G. (1973). The culture cluster. Foreign Language Annals, 6, 31-38.

Morain, G. (1979). The cultoon. Canadian Modern Language Review, 35, 676-690.

Morain, G. (1983). Commitment to the teaching of foreign cultures. Modern Language Journal, 67(iv), 403-412.

Muchnick, A. G. & Wolfe, D. E. (1982). Attitudes and motivations of American students of Spanish. Canadian Modern Language Review, 38, 262-281.

Omaggio-Hadley, Alice. (1993). Teaching language in context. Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. Modern Language Journal, 78(i), 12-28.

Roberts, L. P. (1992). Attitudes of entering university freshmen toward foreign language study: A descriptive analysis. Modern Language Journal, 76(iii), 275-283.

Schmidt, Richard., Borai, Deena., & Kassabgy, Omneya. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. Oxford (Ed.), Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century (Vol. 11, pp. 9-70). Honolulu: University of Hawai, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. Educational Psychologist, 26(3), 207-231.

Seelye, H. N (1993). Teaching culture: Strategies for intercultural communication. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development, and death. San Francisco: Freeman.

Skehan, P. (1989). Individual differences in second language learning. London: Edward Arnold.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1996). Using multivariate statistics. California State University, Northridge: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Tremblay, P. F. & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. Modern Language Journal, 79(iv), 505-518.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. Psychological Review, 92(4), 548-573.

Weiner, B. (1986). An attributional theory of motivation and emotion. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wong, Maria. Mei-ha. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Motivation and academic achievement: The effects of personality traits and the quality of experience. Journal of Personality, 59(3), 539-574.